

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending. In this paper, claims 1, 11-13, 16-18, 25, and 28 have been amended and new claim 31 has been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. In addition, the Abstract has been amended to correct a typographical error.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of an Ostrover-Kim combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “generating a second parental code when the first parental grade code is not included with the video signal.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Ostrover publication or Kim patent, whether taken alone or in combination.

The Ostrover publication discloses allowing a group of persons to assign a content code to each of a plurality of scenes in a movie. The content code is stored in respective areas of a memory of a playback device. During playback, all the scenes of the movie are shown except the ones that have been assigned a certain content code. For example, the content code may be nudity. The Ostrover device plays back all the scenes of a movie except for nude scenes.

However, Ostrover does not teach or suggest determining whether a first parental grade code is associated with a video signal as a pre-condition to generating a second parental code. In addressing the first parental grade code, the Examiner relied on Paragraphs [5] and [6] of the Ostrover publication. But, these paragraphs disclose a prior-art method which tags each scene of

a movie with an industry content rating code, e.g., R, PG-13, etc. Ostrover does not teach or suggest determining whether such a content rating code exists as a pre-requisite to “generating a second parental code when the first parental grade code is not included with the video signal.”

Claim 1 further recites that “the second parental code corresponds to one of a plurality of parental levels selected by a user for the video signal” and “blocking viewing of an entire program corresponding to the video signal based on the second parental code.” Ostrover does not teach or suggest these features, i.e., the user-selected code received by Ostrover blocks only certain scenes within an movie, not an entire movie as required by claim 1.

The Kim patent was cited for disclosing a method for password-protecting playback of content on a DVD. In addition to password protecting playback, the Kim method allows a user to enter a rating restriction into a DVD player. The rating restriction may be any of the standard ratings including R, PG-13, etc. Once the player has been programmed with the rating restriction and the correct password has been entered, the Kim player will not play back a DVD having a restricted rating.

However, the Kim patent does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Ostrover publication including determining whether a first parental grade code is associated with a video signal as a pre-condition to generating a second parental code.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable and that claims 2-16 are allowable based on their dependency from claim 1 and for at least the following additional reasons.

Dependent claim 11 recites the additional steps of “generating an on-screen display (OSD) menu including a number of playback control options; displaying a message including the information when a parental control option is selected from the menu, wherein the information includes the plurality of parental levels in selectable form; and receiving a signal from a user selecting one of the parental levels corresponding to the second parental code.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Ostrover publication or Kim patent, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 17-26 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Ostrover publication. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 17 recites a recording medium that includes “a second memory area configured to store a parental code that controls viewing access to a video program in the video signal, wherein the parental code is a user-selected code configured to be overwritten with another user-selected code by a command.” The Ostrover publication does not disclose these features.

In Ostrover, the content code selected by a group of viewers is stored in the playback device, not **on the recording medium** (e.g., DVD) itself which provides the video signal as recited in claim 17. Moreover, the recording medium of claim 17 is required to be writable, at least in the area in which the user-selected parental code is stored, and also over-writable in that same area with a new parental code should the user make a change to the original code.

Also, claim 17 recites “a third memory area configured to store status information indicating the renewal of the parental code.” Ostrover does not disclose that its DVD has an area that stores

status information indicating renewal of a user-selected parental code. Rather, in Ostrover all content codes are stored in the playback device for respective scenes in a movie. The Ostrover DVD itself does not store a user-selected parental code or any information relating to the renewal of a user-selected parental code as required by claim 17.

Because the Ostrover publication does not disclose all the features of claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that the Ostrover publication does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims. Regarding claim 17, Applicants further note that Kim also stores its codes in the player and not on a DVD or other recording medium to be played back.

Claim 25 recites features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Ostrover publication. For example, claim 25 recites “a parental code generator that generates a second parental code as the parental code when the first parental grade code is not provided with a video signal.” In addition, claim 25 recites that “the second parental code corresponds to one of a plurality of parental levels selected by a user for the video signal, and wherein the second parental code is used as a basis for blocking viewing of an entire program corresponding to the video signal.” Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 28 recites a controller configured to detect the parental code corresponding to the video signal, wherein “the controller is configured to generate a second parental code as the parental code when the first parental code is not detected, the second parental code corresponding to one of a plurality of parental levels selected by a user for the video signal. These features are not

Reply to Office Action of **March 21, 2008**

disclosed by the Ostrover patent. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 28 and its dependent claims are allowable.

New claim 31 has been added to the application.

Claim 31 recites “storing the second parental code on a DVD or other recording medium with information used to generate the video signal, said information used to generate the video signal blocked from viewing based on the second parental code stored on the DVD or other recording medium.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Ostrover or Kim references, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 10/792,272

Docket No. LT-0035

Reply to Office Action of **March 21, 2008**

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw

Date: June 11, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610